ment decided in April|May, 1987 that the said undertakings given to Delhi High Court subsists. As these companies did not deposit the amount, the Hon'ble Supreme Court was moved for necessary directions to the companies, for immediate compliance of the undertaking.

(c) and (d) The amount was worked out with reference to the prices charged by the companies and the price fixed by the Government.

Price decontrol on neosporin range drugs

1526. SHRI DAYANAND SAHAY:
DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI:
DR. BAPU KALDATE:

Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) what were the basis in which Neosporin, Dilosyn, Banadryl; Halmaccel; Zoandin; Evion; Kenacort having monopoy were recommended for price decontrol;

(b) whether his Ministry verified the turn-over and monopoly share before accepting the recommendations of identification; and

(c) if so, how such discrepancies happened and if not, what are the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI J. VENGAL RAO): (a) to (c) These drugs were recommended by the Kelkar Committee for price decontrol as per its criteria. The exclusion criteria adopted by the Committee are given in reply to Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question No. 1565 for 8.8.88. These were accepted by the Government. It was an Export Committee which submitted its report after detailed study and consulatation with various groups, associations, interested parties, etc. and it was not found necessary to further examine the issues already examined in detail by the Committee. Representations received about discrepancies and categorisation have been forwarded to the Committee.

Implementation of drugs prices

1527. SHRI RAJNI RANJAN SAHU:
DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI:

Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that certain drug companies filed with petitions against the prices fixed for the bulk drugs and formulation under DPCD, 1979;

(b) in how many cases the courts have given final judgements;

(c) the names of the drug companies names of the bulk drugs, names of the formulations along with prices fixed under DPCO, 1979 which were upheld by different courts;

(d) whether it is a fact that certain drug companies did not implement the prices fixed by Government;

(e) if so, the names of such drug companies along with the names of the products for which prices have not been implemented so far;

(f) what are the reasons for not acting as per the court's judgement and not implementing the prices; and

(g) the names of the drug companies whose cases are still pending in courts along with the names of products are the names of courts in which such cases are pending?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI J. VENGAL RAO): (a) to (c) and (g) To the extent information is available is given in the enclosed Statement. (*See below*)

(d) to (f) All the concerned companies were advised to implement the prices and the State Drugs Controllers were also asked to ensure implementation of prices fixed by Government for these companies.

Statement

Sl. No.	Name of the Company	Name of the Bulk Drugs/ Formulations	Details of Orders Passed by the Supreme Court
1	M/s. Cynamid(I) Ltd.	Tetracycline & formualtions	The Court directed to review the case and dispose off, while approving the Principles.
2	Do.	Diethyl carbamino Fomulations.	Do.
3	M/s. Geoffrey Manners & M/s. John Wyeth Ltd.,	Benzathine Penicillin & its formulations	
4	M/s. Hoechst(I) Ltd.,	Baralgon, Pyarolidine Methyl Tetracycline, Pheniramine, Glybenclamaide, Frusemide and Formulations	
5	M/s. Pfizer Ltd.,	Oxytetracycline & its salts & formulations based thereon.	Do.
6	M/s. Parke Davis	Chloramphenicol	Do.
7	M/s. Ethnor Ltd.,	Tetramesol & its formulations.	Do.
8	M/s. Anil Starch Ltd.,	Dextrose Anhydrous	Do.
9	M/s. Merind Ltd.	Dexamethasone & its formulations.	Do.
10	M/s. Tamil Nadu Dadhu	Calcium Lactate	Do.
11	M/s. Criffon Labs . & M/s. Franco Indian Pharmaceuticals Ltd.	Procaine Penicillin CV and its formulations	Do.
12	M/s. S.G. Pharmaceuticals Ltd.	Oxyphen Ut-zone, Oxylocain formulations based thereon	Do.
13.	M/s. Glindia Ltd.	Betamethasone & its formulations	Do

Cases against Rohtak telephones

1528. SHRI JERLIE E. TARIANG: Will the Minister of COMMUNICATIONS be pleased to state:

(a) what is the number of cases filed against Rohtak Telephones by the subscribers during the last one year;

(b) whether the Department had tried to settle the disputes pending in courts; and

(c) what difficulties are being faced by the Telephone Department in compromising the disputes pending in the courts inspite of the intervention of Members of Parliament?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI GIRIDHAR GOMANGO): (a) Three court cases were filed by the telephoene subsribers of Rohtak against the Department.

(b) Yes, Sir. Efforts are always made by the Department to settle the dispute with the telephone subscribers within the framework of the Departmental Rules.

(c) These Court cases arise because subscribers do not comply with regulations of the Government. The question of compromise does not arise.